REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, as amended, and consideration of the following remarks. Claims 1, 16, 17 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-18 remain pending. Claims 1-18 stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Amendments

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out what Applicant regards as the invention. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-15 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat App 2002/0012329 by Atkinson et al. (hereafter the Atkinson reference) in view of US Pat 6,012,030, by French-St. George et al. (hereafter the French reference). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Atkinson reference in view of the French reference, and further in view of the Kernighan reference ("the C Programming Language", 2nd Edition, by Kernighan et al.) Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as will be described in more detail below.

The Atkinson reference teaches a system for dynamic, on the fly, operation on or execution of data and/or software instructions transferred between wireless and/or wired devices. In one embodiment, a protocol stack may be used to enable personal networking between a variety of systems and/or devices that utilize Java or Java-like languages, including, but not limited to, systems and devices that operate with WIN 32, Macintosh OS, UNIX, and real-time operating systems. The systems and/or devices may implement Java or Java-like languages and technology in software, hardware, or both.

The French reference teaches a system of management of speech and audio prompts, and interface presence, in multimodal user interfaces is provided. A communications device having a multimodal user interface including a speech interface, and a non-speech interface, e.g. a graphical or tactile user interface, comprises means for dynamically switching between a background state of the speech interface and a foreground state of the speech interface in accordance with a users input modality choice. Preferably, in the foreground state speech prompts and speech based error recovery are fully implemented and in a background state speech prompts are replaced by earcons, and no speech based error recovery is implemented. Thus there is provided a device which automatically subdue the speech prompts when a user selects a non-speech input/output mechanism. Also provided is a method for dynamic adjustment of audio prompts and speech prompts by switching from a foreground state to a background state of a speech interface in response to a users current interaction modality, by selecting alternative states for speech and audio interfaces that represent users needs for speech prompts. This type of system and method is particularly useful and applicable to hand held Internet access communication devices.

The Kernighan reference discloses an instruction in the C programming language for manually placing objects that may be accessed frequently into registers.

As to claims 1, 17 and 18, neither the Atkinson reference nor the French reference, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses nor suggests a plurality of servers providing a plurality of services to said client device in the form of said device-independent applications. The Examiner relies on page 5 paragraph 50 of the Atkinson reference but no where in the cited portion of Atkinson is "a plurality of servers providing a plurality of services to said client device in the form of said device-independent applications" described or suggested.

Further, the Examiner relies on page 1, paragraph 12 through page 2 paragraph 13 of the Atkinson reference to teach "a gateway for preprocessing communications between said client device and said plurality of servers ***thereby reducing processing requirements on said client device***" (emphasis added). Applicant submits that page 1, paragraph 12 through page 2 paragraph 13 of the Atkinson reference teaches a

communication layer that assembles and reassembles the data for the appropriate protocol of transmission but does not perform any "preprocessing" of the data that will reduce the "processing requirements on said client device" as Atkinson's client device must similarly extract the data from the protocol formatting that that Atkinson's communication layer formatted the data into. Applicant therefore contends that Atkinson's communication layer does not reduce the "processing requirements on said client device" as claimed in claims 1, 17 and 18. Specifically, Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to paragraph 0028 that states in pertinent part:

> "The wireless gateway tier 102 is responsible for providing services that lighten the load on the client by doing as much preprocessing as possible ***and*** for any protocol translation between the server and the client device. For example, the gateway performs ***content transformation*** to WML (Wireless Markup Language) or XHTML, converts from HTTP (Hyper Text Transport Protocol) to WAP, does Byte-code verification, authenticates Java applications, provides push services, and other services." (emphasis added)

Therefore, Applicant contends that neither of the Atkinson reference nor the French reference, whether considered alone or in combination, teaches nor suggests "a gateway for preprocessing communications between said client device and said plurality of servers thereby reducing processing requirements on said client device, wherein said preprocessing communications includes transforming any content" as claimed in claims 1, 17 and 18. Accordingly, Applicant contends that claims 1, 17 and 18 are patentable over either of the Atkinson reference or the French reference, whether considered alone or in combination and therefore respectfully requests these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

As to claims 2-16: each of claims 2-16 depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinct over the Atkinson reference and the French reference, whether considered alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as set out above for claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Further, to claim 16, neither the Atkinson reference nor the French reference nor the Kernighan reference, whether considered alone or in any combination, teach or suggest an application framework for mobile devices comprising a multi-tier architecture comprising a first tier capable of processing device-independent applications, a third tier providing a plurality of services to said first tier, a second tier for preprocessing communications between said first tier and said third tier thereby reducing processing requirements on said first tier, wherein said preprocessing communications includes transforming any content. The first tier includes at least one application object class and a manager object capable of managing each of the at least one application object class. A plurality of peer-to-peer communication layers between said third tier and said first tier through said second tier is also included. Said second tier providing protocol translation between said third tier and said first tier. The manager object ***creates a registry in the first tier*** that includes a ***table*** of each of said at least one application object class and wherein the registry includes an application object class ID for each of said at least one application object class. (emphasis added).

Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 16 ***does not state*** that objects are to be placed in ***registers*** as described in the Kernighan reference but rather creates a ***registry*** (i.e., a table) of the objects available to be used. The available objects are identified by their respective class ID. Specifically, referring to paragraph 0054 that states in pertinent part:

> "The registry is a ***table*** of what kind of services are available, i.e., what type of mobilets are available, there capabilities, and what kind of information they contain. For example, the e-mail may want to use a calendar function so it would inquire from the mobilet registry for available services. If there is a calendar function, it may then request, fro the mobilet manager, that the calendar function be put in the foreground." (emphasis added)

Therefore, Applicant contends that neither of the Atkinson reference nor the French reference nor the Kernighan reference, whether considered alone or in any combination, teaches nor suggests a manager object that "creates a registry that includes each of said at least one application object class and wherein the registry includes an application object class ID for each of said at least one application object

class." as claimed in claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant contends that claim 16 is patentable over either of the Atkinson reference or the French reference or the Kernighan reference, whether considered alone or in any combination and therefore respectfully requests this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact George B. Leavell at (408) 749-6900, ext 6923.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Ref SUNMP071) for any charges that may be due or credit our account for any overpayment. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTINE PENILLA& GENCARELLA, LLP

Dated: August 26, 2005

George B. Leavell
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,436
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 774-6923
Customer # 32,291